



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/156,957 09/18/98 ELDRIDGE

B 003401.P006D

MM91/0314

JAMES C. SCHELLER, JR.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR AND
ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

EXAMINER

BROWN, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2858

DATE MAILED:

03/14/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/156,957

Applicant(s)

Eldridge et al.

Examiner

Glenn Brown

Group Art Unit
2858



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 1, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 2-35 and 37-60 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 34 and 37-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 53-57 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 2-33, 35, 43-52, and 58-60 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 and 7

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Glenn W. Brown
Glenn W. Brown
Primary Examiner

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2858

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 2-33, 35, and 43-60 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration believes the named inventor or inventors to be the original and first inventor or inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought.

3. Claims 2-33, 35, 43-52, and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 43 (Amended), line 8, "region" should be changed to --regions-- in order to read more clearly. In lines 13 and 14, the terms "the portion", "the elongate section", and "the contact region", used to define the second set of resilient contact structures, are the same terms used for also defining the first set of resilient contact structures in lines 4-10. Therefore, the terminology should be amended in order that a distinction can be made between the parts of the first and second sets.

Art Unit: 2858

In claim 45 (Amended), line 6, the term “freestanding” is both added and deleted. However, the added term should be deleted in order to maintain consistency with following references to the “first plurality of resilient contact structures.”

In claim 52 (Amended), line 4, “the first plurality of resilient contact structures” does not conform to its antecedent. The term “freestanding” (as mentioned with respect to claim 45) is missing. (The same deficiency also appears in claims 46-48.) Also, in line 5, “region” (second occurrence) should be changed to --regions-- in order to read more clearly.

In claim 5 (Amended), lines 3-4, it is unclear whether or not “a second plurality of resilient contact structures” is meant to be the same as the “second *set* of resilient contact structures” as mentioned in claim 43. Also, it is unclear whether or not the “second plurality of terminals” is meant to be the same as the “second *set* of terminals” as mentioned in claim 43.

In claim 8 (Amended), line 6, before “contact” the word --resilient-- is missing in order to clarify that there are truly a first and a second plurality of resilient contact structures. Also, the suggested addition would provide an antecedent for later references to this term.

In claim 13 (Amended), lines 3-4, “the resilient contact structure” is indefinite as to which of the pluralities of resilient contact structures this term is referring.

In claim 14 (Amended), lines 3-4, “the resilient contact structure” is indefinite as mentioned with respect to claim 13.

In claim 23 (Amended), line 2, “planarity” should be changed to --orientation-- in order to maintain consistency.

Art Unit: 2858

In claim 24 (Amended), lines 2-3, “a first of the inner differential screw elements” is unclear since there is only one “inner differential screw element” claimed (see claim 23, line 4).

In claim 26 (Amended), line 2, “planarity” should be --orientation--.

In claim 30 (Amended), lines 4-6, the phrase “said space transformer adapted in use for contact regions of the first plurality of contact structures making pressure contacts with...” is unclear. The language should be amended so that the meaning of the phrase is clearly expressed. Also in line 5, the term “first” should be deleted in order to maintain consistency. In lines 10-11, the phrase “adapted in use for contact regions...” is unclear as mentioned above. This terminology also appears in lines 13-15. In line 12, before “contact” the term --resilient-- is missing in order to provide an antecedent for the same in line 14.

In claim 32 (Amended), line 3, “first surface” should be changed to --second surface-- since the second plurality of resilient contact structures are disposed on the second surface of the interposer. In line 5, “second” should be --first--.

In claim 33 (Amended), lines 7 and 9, the terms “first” and “second” are reversed as explained with respect to claim 32.

In claim 35 (Amended), line 2, it is unclear which one of the pluralities of resilient contact structures the term “the resilient contact structure” is referring to.

In line 2 of each of claims 46-48, the term “freestanding” should be inserted after “resilient” (only if “freestanding” is not already deleted from claim 45).

Art Unit: 2858

In line 2 of each of claims 50 and 51, "planarity" should be changed to --orientation-- in order to maintain consistency.

In line 2 of each of claims 58 and 59, "planarity" should be --orientation--.

In claim 60, line 5, "region" should be changed to --regions-- since the term pitch can only be defined between a plurality of locations (regions).

In claim 17, line 4, after "plurality" the term --of-- is missing.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-4771.


Glenn Brown

March 9, 2000